

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99299
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of long term spatial-temporal variability of wind speed
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	YES Title needs a mare edit (should put the projected area name) Abstract should be more precise. It should be concise, clear, and informative. Remember to keep your abstract brief and to the point, and avoid including unnecessary details or technical jargon. There needs a remarkable work on the structure. Section names should follow a unique spelling strategy (for example, Introduction, SUMMERY AND CONCLUSION/ REFERENCES). They should be Introduction, Summery and Conclusion/ References or INTRODUCTION, SUMMERY AND CONCLUSION/ REFERENCES. Follow just one (as per journal's requirement). The section should end with writing a paragraph. Not just leaving like with an equation. YES, but it needs to specify the goal of the study. What is the purpose of studying the variability of wind speed? YES	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The grammar should be grossly checked. The writing should be more academic.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why the figures and tables are below references? Is that a part of appendix? If YES, put appendix number clearly. Or, place the respective tables/figures it their proper position. Fonts should be same all through the article. Equations should bear proper referencing. Indentations for different paragraph should be unique. Here, the authors used different indentation. (Sometimes visually separate (using TAB key in the first line of the paragraph), hanging indent etc.). Authors may cite from these two papers. (https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/18/5628, https://ph01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/RAST/article/view/90448) Other comments are written in the manuscript (as comments). The author should tell clearly about MK test, Sen's Slope if they are applied by the authors themselves to the wind data they got from NASA, or they are just calculated already by NASA. Wind speed class of the specified data should be talked about. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khandaker D Islam
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan